

Remarks/Arguments:

In support of the response filed May 10, 2010, a Declaration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.132 is provided herewith explaining the differences between wall-flow filters and flow-through substrates.

As discussed in the response of May 10, 2010, claim 1 is directed to a method of manufacturing a catalysed ceramic wall-flow filter. Claim 1 expressly recites that "reducing pressure in the pore structure of the wall-flow filter occurs prior to contacting the surface of the evacuated channel walls with the liquid and the plurality of channels in the wall-flow filter are plugged at an inlet end or an outlet end of the wall-flow filter." Thus, as claimed, the method is used for making a wall-flow filter.

The Declaration of Paul Andersen provided herewith describes the differences between wall-flow filters and flow-through substrates. As explained, wall-flow filters are plugged at alternating inlet and outlet ends, which causes the gas to pass through or across the channel walls. Declaration paragraph 5. See also the disclosure at page 2, lines 11-18 of the original specification. On the other hand, flow-through substrates do not have plugged ends and the gas passes straight through the channels, and the gas does not pass across channel walls. Declaration paragraph 6.

As previously argued, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because Shimrock et al. describes a flow-through substrate, not a wall-flow filter.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher R. Lewis, Reg. No. 36,201
Christine E. Brown, Reg. No. 65,752
Attorneys for Applicant

CRL/CEB/lrb

Attachment: Declaration of Paul J. Andersen

Dated: July 6, 2010

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **18-0350** for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.